

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATION

* * * * *

Randolph E. Stefanson, as
guardian ad litem for Steven
G. Roman, Jr.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Henry Fehr and Schneider
National Carriers, Inc.,

Defendant.

Civ. No. 06-169 (PJS/RLE)

* * * * *

Steven G. Roman,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Henry Fehr, Schneider
National Carriers, Inc.,

Defendants,

and

State of Minnesota,
Human Services Department,

Movant for Intervention. Civ. No. 06-1444 (JMR/RLE)

* * * * *

For reasons neither apparent, nor explained, these two actions involve the same cause of action, the same motor vehicle accident, and the same counsel of Record, and yet they were separately filed. We recommend that the two actions be consolidated for all pretrial and Trial purposes, with the parties' submissions to the Court being transferred from Civ. No. 06-1444 (JMR/RLE), to Civ. No. 06-169 (PJS/RLE), and that all future filings be filed only in the latter case.¹

NOW, THEREFORE, It is --

RECOMMENDED:

1. That Civ. No. 06-1444 (JMR/RLE) be consolidated with Civ. No. 06-169 (PJS/RLE) for all pretrial and Trial purposes.

¹Civ. No. 06-169 (PJS/RLE) is related to Soyring et al. vs. Fehr, et al., Civ. No. 05-1900 (PJS/RLE), as both involve Plaintiffs who were injured in the same motor vehicle collision.

2. That all current filings in Civ. No. 06-1444 (JMR/RLE) be transferred to Civ. No. 06-169 (PJS/RLE), and that all future filings be filed only in Civ. No. 06-169 (PJS/RLE).

Dated: July 24, 2006

s/Raymond L. Erickson
Raymond L. Erickson
CHIEF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

Pursuant to Rule 6(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, D. Minn. LR1.1(f), and D. Minn. LR72.1(c)(2), any party may object to this Report and Recommendation by filing with the Clerk of Court, and by serving upon all parties **by no later than August 10, 2006**, a writing which specifically identifies those portions of the Report to which objections are made and the bases of those objections. Failure to comply with this procedure shall operate as a forfeiture of the objecting party's right to seek review in the Court of Appeals.

If the consideration of the objections requires a review of a transcript of a Hearing, then the party making the objections shall timely order and file a complete transcript of that Hearing **by no later than August 10, 2006**, unless all interested

parties stipulate that the District Court is not required by Title 28 U.S.C. §636 to review the transcript in order to resolve all of the objections made.